



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Services as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

E. J. Percease
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 5 Sep. 2001

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: DB000575-014

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Keeth, et al)	Examiner:	Not yet assigned
Serial No.:	09/893,389)	Art Unit:	2818
Filed:	28 June 2001)		
Entitled:	256 MEG DYNAMIC RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY			

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington DC 20231

RECEIVED
SEP 12 2001
MAIL ROOM

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment of 27 August 2001, Applicants have enclosed a clean version and a marked-up version of the replacement paragraph that was amended by the preliminary amendment of 28 June 2001. Applicants have also enclosed a replacement preliminary amendment, a copy of the preliminary amendment filed in the parent case, and a copy of the preliminary amendment filed with the above-identified application. The preliminary amendments, when considered with the original specification, contain a total of 465 claims. Of these 465 claims, claims 1-442 are to be cancelled, leaving claims 443-465 for examination.

The above-identified application is a divisional of U.S. application Serial No. 09/620,606 (the parent application), which is a divisional of U.S. application Serial No. 08/916,692 (the grandparent application). The grandparent application contained claims

1 – 80. The parent application was filed with a preliminary amendment, which added claims 81 – 465. That preliminary amendment (a copy of which is enclosed herewith) was inadvertently omitted at the time that the instant application was filed, but was incorporated by reference by the Utility Application Transmittal and was filed on 22 August 2001 in conjunction with a Request for a Corrected Filing Receipt.

The Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment also contains a statement that the 28 June 2001 preliminary amendment did not include a marked-up version of the amended claims. Applicants have not responded to this statement because the preliminary amendment filed on 28 June 2001 did not amend any claims. Claims 1-442 were cancelled and text in the specification was amended (clean and marked up versions are enclosed), but no claims were amended. Applicants, therefore, assert that the preliminary amendment of 28 June 2001 was not missing a marked-up version of any allegedly amended claims.

In conclusion, Applicants have enclosed a clean and a marked up version of the amended specification text. Applicants have enclosed a replacement preliminary amendment and copies of the preliminary amendments filed in the above-identified application and in the parent application. When these preliminary amendments are considered together with the original specification there are a total of 465 claims. Of these 465 claims, claims 1-442 are cancelled leaving claims 443-465 for examination.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske

Reg. No. 29,688

THORP REED & ARMSTRONG, LLP

One Oxford Centre, 14th Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15219-4895

(412) 394-7789

Dated: 5 September 2001

Attorneys for Applicants